DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 440 970 SP 039 207

AUTHOR	Meyer, Tom
TITLE	Finding a Voice and Place in a Normative Profession.
PUB DATE	2000-04-00
NOTE	37p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (New Orleans, LA, April 24-28, 2000).
PUB TYPE	Reports - Research (143) -- Speeches/Meeting Papers (150)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Beginning Teacher Induction; *Beginning Teachers; Collegiality; Elementary Secondary Education; *Faculty Development; Higher Education; *Inquiry; Mentors; Preservice Teacher Education; Student Teachers; *Teacher Collaboration; Teacher Improvement
IDENTIFIERS	*Learning Communities; *Stanford Teacher Education Program; Stanford University CA

ABSTRACT

This qualitative case study identified how various conditions supported one voluntary novice teacher learning community called STEP+. Participants were all graduates of Stanford University's teacher education program (STEP), a fifth-year, combined master's and credential program. STEP+ teachers convened for as many as 5 years away from their school sites as they went from being preservice teachers to third-, fourth-, and fifth-year teachers. Participants completed several interviews about STEP+ over the years. The first section of the paper locates the discussion of this beginning teacher learning community against the backdrop of literature about induction, professional development that often rests on mentor teachers to train new teachers. The next section contrasts this with collaborative, inquiry-oriented professional development (IOPD), a less technical model. The discussion of the culture of the STEP+ learning community, which is an example of IOPD, has implications for teacher educators invested in novice teachers' personal and professional development. The paper offers descriptive analysis of the norms, structures, and content that mattered for learning at STEP+. Implications for induction policy and practice are noted, and new questions are raised. (Contains 95 references.) (SM)

Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made
from the original document.

ED 440 970

Finding a Voice and Place in a Normative Profession

Tom Meyer
meyert@newpaltz.edu

SUNY NEW PALTZ
April, 2000

Paper presented at the Annual AERA Convention: New Orleans, LA

SP039207

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

T. Meyer

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

Finding a Voice and Place in a Normative Profession

Overview

It would be wonderful to simply put novice teachers together and say, "They will learn." Why would a community of novice teachers voluntarily meet for years? How could a professional development site sustain its participants? The analysis in this paper identifies how three conditions supported one voluntary, *novice* teacher learning community called STEP+. STEP+ teachers convened for *years away from their school sites* as the participants went from being pre-service teachers to third, fourth and fifth year teachers (Meyer, 1999). In the first section of the paper, I locate the discussion of this novice teacher learning community against a backdrop of literature about induction, professional development that often rests on "mentors" teachers to "train" new teachers. I contrast this with collaborative, inquiry-oriented professional development (IOPD), a less technical model. The discussion of the culture of the STEP+ community, an example of IOPD, has implications for teacher educators invested in novice teachers' personal and professional development. The paper offers descriptive analysis of the norms, structures and content that mattered for learning at STEP+.

Beyond retention: professional development that tends to the person(s)

Most educators, and many citizens of the U.S., know about the shortage of teachers that is about to hit. Some estimate that 2 million teachers will be hired in the next decade.[1] Of the new teachers to enter the field—many never enter who prepare—about 30-50% will leave the field within five to six years (Weingarten, 1998; Huling-Austin, 1986). The problem often gets framed that our schools need to do something to help *support* and *retain* our teaching force so that we are not caught in a continual cycle of hiring. One recent and popular policy response has been to fund "induction" programs to support, retain and evaluate teachers. This recognition translates to significant monies being made available by many states around the country to support induction programs. Calfornia, for instance, allocated $76 million to the Beginning Teacher Support & Assessment Program in 1998-1999. "Induction" funding and practice varies state by state and even within states.

Teacher educators--whether they are known as professors, supervisors, mentors, or administrators--need to think beyond support and retention as the ultimate goal for novice teachers. We need to create places for novice teachers to define themselves as professionals in a normative profession, rather than as isolated technicians servicing students. Too often, in group settings or in

mentor-mentee relationships, induction is often guided by phrases like 'here's what you will be able to do tomorrow' or 'today we will talk about how *our* school will prepare for this May's statewide testing.' Although this instrumental approach might eliminate a level of stress that novice teachers experience, I worry that professional development like this will probably be geared more towards *how* rather than *why*, why not or when not. I also worry that policy and practices do not necessarily cultivate the active role in learning that this study documents and that is advocated by professional development theorists. In fact, induction is complicated by a variety of factors that possibly preclude novice teachers' access to sustaining professional development.

Even if induction might instrumentally "help" new teachers, it will do little to alter problems that are endemic to the culture of schools. In spite of the best-laid induction plans, novice teachers will encounter many problems that can not be *fixed* by caring teacher educators. Induction may not be able to correct for novices teaching out of their subject matter expertise[ii], teaching five classes in five classrooms, teaching at a school site that has an ideology that does not mesh with that of the novice teacher nor the university at which she prepared. Induction may not help novices teach students who dislike school or students who share little in the way of cultural background, etc. Teachers, especially new teachers, work in isolation and privacy (Veenman, 1984).

Not only are novice teachers regularly left to sink or swim (Huberman, 1992), but in many schools their jobs require them to be adept at teaching textbooks selected by others. Teaching can become a dull job, fast, for secondary teachers who enter the field loving their subject matter and learning, especially when they discover they are there to teach some 150 students to pass a statewide exam. Decisions about curriculum, its scope and sequence, are often determined by others. Duckworth (1994) warns us about treating the teacher as a civil servant.

> In conceiving of teachers as civil servants, with no professional understanding worth paying attention to, we miss the enormous potential power of their knowledge. Even more serious: in considering them as civil servants, we fail to develop their knowledge and understanding still further. . . To the extent that they are conceived of as civil servants, to carry out orders from above, teachers are deprived of the occasion to bring to bear on their work the whole of their intelligence, understanding and judgement. To that extent, the students are deprived of those qualities, and the educational enterprise is impoverished (p.16).

If the purpose of induction is to give civil servants the tools needed to accomplish a set task, then teaching can be considered a job that defies uncertainty. But any educator worth their salt will tell you that teaching is difficult for the problematic situations that arise daily. Professionals must

exercise and mete out judgement, knowledge, understanding, and compassion. They must understand their subject matter and their students. They must find ways to create a climate and teach skills for deep student learning.

It is exciting how broadly understood the need to support new teachers is. Many states prepare the wave of new teachers by pairing them with mentor teachers. These programs, however, are uneven and often rest on mentor's goodwill and intuition. One New York district, leaving nothing up to chance, offers mentors the following guidelines for divvying up their time with novices. Note the precision with which they identify "activity percentages".

Activity Percentage of time

• Building familiarization .02	• District procedures 4.0
• Arrangement of classroom 1.6	• Intern observation of mentor 5.2
• Assignment of homework 2.5	• Mentor observation of intern 6.2
• Visiting other classrooms 3.1	• Lesson execution 6.6
• Report card grading 3.4	• Use of resources 6.8
• Planning follow up lessons 3.4	• Other* 7.5
• Questioning techniques 3.4	• Classroom discipline 7.8
• Test grading 3.6	• Professional growth 8.8
• Test making 3.9	• Lesson planning 9.5
	• Personal support 10.1

"Other" includes activities not listed on worksheet (parent conferencing, outdoor education, observation follow-up, discussion of field trips, etc.)

Unfortunately ambiguity, rather than precision, defines mentoring. Being a mentor is complicated and under-theorized (Little, 1990). Induction construed as a mentor *helping* a novice is problematic. When a mentor "takes on" a novice because of her expertise as a classroom instructor, it might be a reward. Rarely, however, is it an indication of the mentor's expertise as a teacher educator. Is the purpose more to put beginning teachers at ease or to help them develop habits of inquiry and judgement (Feiman-Nemser & Parker, 1992)? When should the mentor guide? Give? Mold? Teach? Model? Evaluate? Learn?

Recent literature suggests that a novice teacher can benefit from "co-planning" new curriculum with a mentor (Feiman-Nemser, 1995). In co-planning the novice teacher learns from hearing and seeing how her mentor articulates some of her buried, practical knowledge. Conversely, as they work to develop a unit of instruction, a mentor can learn about new curriculum materials or pedagogy from the novice. The teacher education that results from "co-planning" or "co-teaching" involves reciprocity. To engage in this sort of "joint work" (Little, 1993), a mentor would need to be willing to try something new, putting aside a previously developed idea. This involves a level of sacrifice and time, not to mention a disposition for experimentation. It also requires a level of commitment. I recently spoke with a second-year teacher. In her school, by next year, nearly 50%

5
BEST COPY AVAILABLE

of the staff will be novice teachers. Her district-assigned (and paid) mentor has never introduced herself.

Because of power differentials and complicating factors such as evaluation–beginning teachers rarely have job security–a novice may leave certain moral and ethical concerns unvoiced. For example, one second-year teacher in the STEP+ study talked about a secret she had kept under wraps for over a year. A student had called her a racist under his breath. She never knew if she had handled the situation as she would have wished. Yet she never brought this topic up at the school site because there was no safe place to explore it. Like all teachers, new teachers will experience moral and ethical dilemmas (McDonald, 1992; Lyons, 1990; Cuban, 1992; Ben-Peretz & Kremer-Hayon, 1990). However, being new, and often isolated, novice teachers do not necessarily have a store of professional knowledge that they can draw on to help them determine how to act or make sense of the dilemmas. Novices need chances to ask questions that can not be easily answered; they need to explore dilemmas and deliberate about them as they *develop* as professionals. A discussion of how to acquit oneself of a racism charge probably falls outside of the realm of normal induction. In induction, the novice teacher, her worldview, beliefs and questions are often incidental within the structures and purposes of such enterprises.

I suggest that instead of wringing our hands and worrying about the predictable attrition of new teachers, teacher educators need to think carefully about how to support professional development for new teachers so that they can be well, teach well and find their place and voice in a normative profession. Novice teachers need professional development opportunities that allow them to think *with others* about the teacher they want to be given the students that they teach and the contexts within which they work. These must be safe places so that the teachers can explore who they are and who they want to become (Hollingsworth, 1992; Helms, 1996).

Inquiry-oriented professional development that is collaborative

Teachers together: working or learning? At this point in American education there are many opportunities for teachers to *work* together. Classroom doors may be closed, but spaces can and do open up for teachers to gather at their school site. For instance, teachers meet in governance groups, in grade-level teams and as teachers of common students in the same middle school "house". There are seminars in the summer and after school to support recent "hires" with skills needed to cope. Many groups are mandatory and contrived rather than voluntary and naturally forming (Hargreaves, 1992). Obviously work needs to be accomplished in any

institution. Therefore school teams can be valuable and even contribute to students getting a better education as educators fine-tune unit plans or budget plans. But work groups of this variety may or may not provide teachers adequate opportunities to learn from experience. It is quite likely that mandatory work groups are task-oriented rather than value-oriented, reaching quiet compromises rather than exploring differences of opinions (Achinstein, 1998).

Teachers "being developed" together may not always mean that they are *learning* together. One case in point is the oft-criticized professional development days that districts supply. These one-size fits all "superintendent days" regularly occur without follow up. An outside expert trying to breeze in and simultaneously meet the needs of an entire faculty does not work well (Miller & Lord, 1995). There is literature about teachers who work together and do learn. Not only is there literature to support this shift in professional development, but the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards makes explicit that as professionals, "teachers think systematically about their practice and learn from experience and develop membership in learning communities (1994). STEP+ was a voluntary, "networked-based" learning community in which teachers worked together with the intention of learning about teaching and themselves. Huberman (1992) speculates that truly useful professional development occurs in "makeshift bungalows." What makes these arrangements possible is that they "provide backing for temporary groups of teachers working in a problem space that is collectively meaningful and is of some urgency" (p. 138).

One powerful version of teacher learning suggests that teachers learn from each other in *communities*, rather than from "outside" or "visiting" experts, as transmission models of professional development suggest. Even though the profession often demands that teachers work alone, there is no reason that they should learn alone—especially given the dilemmas and difficulties of teaching. In collaborative community settings, teachers "reflect" on or engage in "inquiry" about their practical experiences in order to support and better understand their students' learning. As Lee Shulman (1988) so eloquently put it, "learning from experience requires that a teacher be able to look back on his or her own teaching and consequences. The ordinary school setting does not lend itself to such reflection. It is characterized by speed, solitude, and amnesia" (p. 181).

Rather than being technicians who can be *given* best practices, *in inquiry-oriented conceptions of professional development* (IOPD), together, teachers are always becoming, always trying to hone personal and just philosophies and practices (Soltis, 1994). The teacher has access to and learns from other teachers in collaborative settings in order to meet the needs of students, peers, and the

profession. In IOPD, teachers are out from behind closed classroom doors, examining student work, exchanging ideas, describing experiences, and discussing beliefs. Outcomes associated with IOPD include increased teacher efficacy, agency, experimentation, knowledge, and capacity to practice and understand complex pedagogies advocated by recent reforms (see for example, Hollingsworth & Sockett, 1994; Cochran-Smith & Lytle, 1993; Goswami & Stillman, 1987; Stenhouse, 1985).[iii] The teacher is a practicing and public intellectual (Giroux, 1994). The learning is sustaining, an important antidote for the emotionally flat and sometimes, depressing school days that stretch between Monday and Friday (Goodlad, 1984; Lieberman, 1995). Labels for IOPD, include the following: "teacher learning communities," "teacher research groups," "action research groups," "subject matter networks," "teacher networks" and inquiry-oriented teacher education.

The IOPD literature is compelling because of the unique portraits it offers of specific, local efforts that support teacher learning in a variety of contexts. Though the portraits demonstrate similarities-- teachers *talking* systematically about teaching and learning *over time*—each portrait demonstrates how different goals and conditions govern each group. The teachers' talk is not incidental, as in "By the way, did I tell you about what I did yesterday?" Instead it is intentional and in some cases, systematic. For instance, Palinscar, Magnusson, Marano, Ford and Brown (1997) studied how teachers learned about teaching science using an inquiry model. The teachers' meetings involved following a conversational protocol. The "presenting" teacher stated assertions about ways to modify a model of science instruction, then provided practical examples to illustrate the assertions (e.g., videotape, student work, anecdotes), and finally, elaborated a rationale for the assertions. Similarly, at the Prospect School, Carini (1979) describes a systematic approach that the teachers used to discuss and summarize their observations about students. IOPD portraits reveal idiosyncrasies that make each site somewhat unique. IOPD portraits document teachers gathered together to talk about issues that relate to teaching, learning and being teachers of certain disciplines or students ((Feldman (1994a); Thomas, Wineburg, Grossman, Myhre & Woolworth (1998), Helms (1986)).

In many of these and other such cases, the researcher was a participant observer in a conversational setting. To the degree that learning is mediated by *who* one is with when learning, we need to know more about how facilitators support teacher learning. This draws on Vygotsky's (1978) notion of the zones of proximal development (ZPD)—the idea being that any of us is smarter and more capable when in proximity to more capable peers. Just as "student-centered" teaching is not teacher-free, teacher learning often depends on capable facilitation. We need to

develop a more nuanced understanding of the roles that "more expert peers" play in IOPD settings. In this paper, I offer a detailed analysis of the role that the facilitator took in the STEP+ setting.

One of the dilemmas for advocates of IOPD is not whether or not IOPD supports teacher learning, there are many portraits that substantiate that, but more how to duplicate IOPD opportunities for teachers. I suspect that this is the wrong goal. Since many IOPD sites are voluntary, flexibly meeting the needs of the participants, by their nature they will be idiosyncratic. This is a paper for teacher educators who are interested in what conditions might be central for *sustained* and sustaining professional development of novice teachers. Are there particular features of the IOPD cultures that can guide teacher educators who are striving to facilitate early professional development for novice teachers that sustains them during an exciting but difficult career period?

RESEARCH SETTING, DATA COLLECTION AND ANALYSIS

Research Setting. This study grows out from a 5+ year, voluntary collaboration among San Francisco Bay Area teachers and two university researchers. This study originally sat within a larger consortium of researchers' efforts at Stanford, University of California at Berkeley, and Vanderbilt University funded by the Mellon Foundation to study Brown and Campione's "Fostering a Community of Learners."[iv] The teacher community, STEP+, was composed of self-selected members, each of whom graduated from Stanford University's teacher education program (STEP) -- a fifth-year, combined masters and credential program. Each member of STEP+ enrolled in an elective offered within their pre-service program, titled "Fostering Communities of Teachers as Learners"(FCTL). As part of their Stanford coursework, they had kept teaching journals, conducted action research, written case studies about the "vicissitudes" of practice, and regularly examined dilemmas of teaching, both their own and others'. In short, given the emphasis on activities promoting reflection on practice, their pre-service could be considered IOPD (Tabachnick & Zeichner, 1991).

A subgroup of the teachers from the original pre-service continued to meet voluntarily for up to five years beyond pre-service in spite of the fact that they worked at different schools and school levels (middle school and high school) and taught different subjects (mathematics, science, language arts, and social studies). At the monthly meetings, anywhere from 6 to 14 people convened for about three hours at a teacher's house for a meal and a discussion. The protocol for meeting evolved over the years. In each meeting, in addition to a meal, there was

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

nearly always a **"check-in"** followed by a **"charrette."** In check-in, each participant briefly reported what was going on in his or her life. This included personal and professional information. This entire process transpired in about 30 minutes. Check-in was followed by another ritual, the charrette. In this group, charrettes were formal, inquiry-based protocols centered on the presentation and subsequent discussion of teacher-selected **artifacts** (e.g., a video clip of a student literature seminar; a one-page account of a pressing dilemma, a teaching document).

Unlike the check-in ritual, in which *all* members briefly presented a spontaneous self-report, the charrette norm was for *one* teacher to take 20-30 minutes to present a classroom artifact (e.g., curricular unit, videotape, student writing, student assessments). For the charrette, a teacher-presenter would bring an artifact, set the context for it, and provide the group with a frame or focus in which to respond. Thus, the presenter explained what the group would be seeing, offering relevant technical, contextual, and even theoretical background. While offering this preliminary interpretation, the presenter asked the respondents to consider an overarching and/or unresolved question. After the presentation and framing, the whole group generally conversed for about an hour. This entire charrette process transpired in approximately 60-80 minutes. The charrette structure had two primary roles: presenter and respondents. Normally teachers presented and responded while university facilitators only responded (see facilitation section). By Year Two, the STEP+ group had made it an overt expectation that the presenting teacher would select an artifact that would further the collective inquiry goals of the group: to study how students learn through talking about curriculum. What ensued was a conversation about the particular artifact and related ideas, issues, and experiences.

What did the teachers discuss? Over the years, the group talked considerably about **Reciprocal Teaching (RT)**, a method that sits at the core of the COL pedagogy (Brown, 1998). At STEP+, RT was a topic that STEP+ teachers read about, learned about from visiting teachers and eventually experimented with and modified. Eventually many of the teachers experimented with a variety of practices that emphasized and encouraged students to talk about the curriculum they were studying.

In RT, young readers learn skills that more expert readers use, learning to apply necessary strategies in order to deepen their understanding and interaction with the text (Palinscar & Brown, 1984). Alfassi (1998) explains that at the center of RT and other similar methods, there is "an active reader who constructs meaning through the integration of existing and new knowledge and uses strategies to foster, monitor, regulate and maintain comprehension." Thus, the reader attends

to numerous tasks simultaneously when reading. While trying to comprehend material, the reader is constantly using self-monitoring strategies in order to gauge how the comprehension is going (e.g., "what did that paragraph mean?"). Self-monitoring is a form of metacognition and is central to this view of reading which suggests that if students learn what more proficient readers do--think of prior relevant experience, remain aware of (mis)understanding--they can become better readers.[vi]

Research Design & Data Collection. To understand the underlying conditions that governed this teacher learning community, I designed a qualitative case study using ethnographic methods of participant observation, direction observation, interview and document collection (Merriam, 1988; Yin, 1989). This approach seemed sensible since I wanted to gain a "holistic overview" of the STEP+ context (Miles & Huberman, 1993, p. 6; Patton, 1990). Finally, given that this *novice* teacher group was highly unusual–professional development literature typically described pre-service or veteran teachers' learning communities–the study of a "revelatory" case supported my efforts to "build theories" that could illuminate ways of understanding other novice teacher groups in similar circumstances (Merriam, 1988; Yin, 1994, p.40).

I wanted to understand more about STEP+ as a "community of practice" (Lave & Wegner, 1991) with a particular "identity kit" (Gee, 1989). These ideas about learning suggest communities–like STEP+-have a particular culture, a set of norms, rituals, even language that participants share and know. For my study I wanted to comment on what I saw or understood to be true about the STEP+ learning culture from my perspective as an "insider" and vantage point as a participant observer; I also wanted to document what each of the teachers understood about the culture. In order to support these efforts, I documented each of 50+, 3-hour meetings by audiotaping, writing field notes, conceptual memos and meeting notes. I selectively transcribed several meetings each year.

I used a variety of interview techniques to help me understand the teachers' perceptions of the STEP+ culture--its discourse, rituals, and the implicit rules that governed it. I conducted numerous informal interviews and two semi-structured interviews with each of the teachers who remained in STEP+ through Year Two. Each interview lasted about 60-80 minutes and was audiotaped and transcribed verbatim. In both interviews, participants discussed the culture of STEP+. They also discussed the degree to which discourse at STEP+ resonated with other professional discourse they experienced. The first interview was conducted at the end of Year Two and the second, midway through Year Three. I also collected data from four

focus group interviews conducted in the first year and one in Years Two and Three.[1] I invited "outsiders" to conduct these interviews in order to have someone who could ask questions from an authentic *naiveté* that I no longer had (e.g., "what do you do at these meetings?").

Analysis. I took a grounded theory approach to my analysis, constantly trying to make sense of the data as I collected it (Glaser & Strauss, 1967). What emerged was a theory about the culture, norms and content that was grounded in the data, to be sure; however, it was also grounded in the literature. Indeed, this study reflects a "steady dialogue between theories and evidence" (Ragin cited in Miles & Huberman, 1984, p. 144). Based on Miles and Huberman (1994), the qualitative data was analyzed on two levels. The first level involved preliminary coding. This process aided in the development of descriptive as well as interpretive statements that lead to the major findings. At regular intervals, I showed my data and writing to the participants and colleagues. Although I went to great lengths to collect and analyze data from a variety of sources, and to scour my analysis for problems, there are obvious limitations. These include my bias for inquiry-oriented professional development and my advocacy for the teachers involved. Our well-developed friendships could have made it difficult for the teachers to be as candid as they might have been with a non-participant during the interviews over the years.

The Makeshift bungalow that was STEP+

> *I don't feel like I have a community of professionals to really work with at school; [whereas] in our group there is that sort of intellectual challenge with my colleagues and that's important to me. At school there is too much gossip about parents, and gossip about students, and complaining about this and that and it's just very day to day. . . . I don't feel there is any professional discourse about teaching as an art or as a profession. (Kay, 6/97)*

Participants spent up to 50 hours at STEP+ in each of the first years of their careers. Like Kay, each of the teachers claimed that STEP+ had a culture that could be identified by the norms that the peers developed, the structures within which they talked and the content about which they talked. Participants described STEP+ as an "ongoing" series of conversations in which they talked about "ideas" "that mattered" in "intellectual," "challenging," and "reflective" ways. Moreover, the participants lauded the active role they took in planning the collective course of action and in determining its pace and its content. They

---

[1] For this paper, I refer to years *beyond* pre-service. Therefore, an interview conducted in Year Two occurred during the teachers' second year of full time teaching.

identified STEP+ with "professional development" and "learning." In contrast, the teachers often disparaged their school-site professional development as a "lame," a "waste of time," a "boring" "joke". They reported that talk with their school-site peers focused on "nuts and bolts" and "day to day" concerns. "Professional discourse" was "not safe."

Three conditions supported the makeshift bungalow that was STEP+. What follows is an analysis of the group's norms, the structures and the content that each played a role in sustaining the interests and development of a small set of novice teachers.

NORMS THAT MATTERED

In retrospective interviews, STEP+ participants linked their recurrent conversations with "learning" and "professional development." These novice teachers, like teachers in other "teacher learning communities," constructed a normative culture that supported them in their learning. Three particular norms, taken together, supported the STEP+ teachers' professional development. They were collective autonomy, private interference, and dispositions of friendship and interrogation.

Collective Authority and Private Interference.

> *The agenda that we bring to the table is one that we collectively create . . . There's not a sense that we are talking about an agenda that somebody has fabricated for us or is bringing for us. And I think that what is unique [even if] we often struggle with what it is that we want to talk about, and what it is that we want to discover(fit.wp.18)*[2]

---

[2] I have developed a series of codes to identify data sources. My hope is that these "retrieval codes" facilitate other researchers' access to the same data (Mehan, 1979). Here is how they work. Take for example the quotation linked to this footnote: "fit.wp.18" The quotation was excerpted from a final interview transcript ("fit"); "wp" refers to one of the teachers in the study. And ".18" refers to page 18 of the interview transcript. The following abbreviations are used for other data sources:

co - classroom observation	Ipi - informal phone interview
cw - case-writing	ii - informal interview
emc - email correspondence	tw - teacher writing from meetings
fgit - focus group interview transcript	mn - meeting notes
	mt - meeting transcript
fit - final interview transcript	pit - preliminary interview transcript
fn - field notes	td - teaching document

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Participants valued the active role and authority they took in the creation and evolution of STEP+ as a site of professional development. The novice teachers created STEP+ as a place to go for conversations about teaching, a place that they entered and exited on their own terms. More than simply creating a site, they collectively set and reset broad agendas for each year that they met, and they negotiated the particular meeting agendas as well.

Participants not only negotiated the content and process for their meetings, they decided on the frequency and pace of their meetings. Participants engaged in ongoing and attentive debates about how the culture of the group could best suit their own needs. For example, one participant described how the nature of learning reflected the volition of the group: "We decide what we want to do . . . If there is a question or issue we research it, we try to answer and assess it and go back to it" (pit.jm.7). Other examples of the autonomy the participants exercised included debates about whether or not the university facilitators should or should not be allowed to take turn to present their work (fn.1095) and about how to use allotted time for the yearly 24-hour retreats (mn.1196; mn.197). The participants' active role stands in contrast to the passive role that teachers normally have in professional development, which is often construed as an opportunity to "train" teachers (Little, 1992b). Although it was sometimes "unsettling" or "tiring" to discuss the group's process (fit.wp.19), ultimately, members of the group felt a sense of ownership and "satisfaction" with STEP+ as a site of professional development. The professional development literature describes the satisfaction that teachers take from exercising autonomy in teacher networks and other IOPD sites (Lieberman & Miller, 1997; Clark, 1992; Little, 1992a).

Private interference.

> *The way my faculty interacts is very different from the way this group interacts, and that is because people don't know each other as well, or don't respect each other's ideas as much or are not as interested in learning what other people are doing in their classrooms. (pit.4)*

Whether they chose to be or not, STEP+ participants often were isolated at their school sites. They did, after all, enter a profession that has been notorious for privacy and non-interference (Rosenholtz, 1989; Little, 1982; Lortie, 1975). Although teachers talk about their work, they spend little if any time observing each other as they practice. At STEP+ this was not the case. In presenting and discussing their own teaching, novice teachers opened *virtual* doors

to their peers from other school sites. The display of videotapes and other artifacts made classroom instruction public in a private place. Furthermore, in this private place, participants regularly gave and took criticism after closely observing each other's classroom practices.

These reflective habits of observation and critique, associated with teacher learning (see for instance McLaughlin & Oberman, 1996; Stokes et al., 1998; Costa & Kallick, 1993), stood in contrast to the "day to day" "planning for tomorrow" that teachers identified with their school sites. Here David offers an insightful contrast:

> *[At STEP+] we don't have to deal with everyday issues. It's a real safe environment. People are really interested. They are doing this on their own time. People aren't rushing off. They're enjoying it and they're really thinking hard. [At] school, people are rushing off; they have got a lot of stuff to do. There is not as much focus and it's not as academic. It's much more product-oriented at school. (pit.ld.5)*

David's observations about his own school echo the norm of presentism that Lortie used to describe the way teachers cope with the occupational presses of school (1975). As one teacher noted, at school, talk "is more product-oriented" and "less focused."

In contrast, the teachers valued the focus and care that they brought to each other's development at STEP+. Although their classrooms were open to interference, it was still up to the participants to crack the doors. The STEP+ teachers benefited from measures of individual privacy. Individually, they decided what, when and how often to share their work. They only convened for a fraction of their professional lives, once per month. They were an interdisciplinary teacher group each working at different schools. Thus a math teacher could ask a "dumb" question about teaching social studies or vice versa. Taken together, the distinct work places, subject matter expertise, and infrequent meetings away from the school site conspired in favorable, albeit subtle, ways for having professional conversations at this stage of teacher development.

Participants' Dispositions: Friendship and Interrogation

Participants brought and cultivated dispositions of *friendship* and *interrogation* to their conversations about teaching and learning (Meyer & Achinstein, 1998; Achinstein & Meyer, 1997).

Friendship.

> *It's the fact that we know each other [that's unique about this group]. And we don't just know each other as . . . okay, we get together, and . . . we just talk about this stuff. I mean, we know about what's going on in each other's lives, and . . . we've had experiences together that are not just this [meeting time]. (pit.tk.2)*

Professional development grows from personal and professional relations. Built on a foundation of friendship, the monthly STEP+ meetings represented an island of emotional support in the often-chaotic sea of beginning teaching. The participants were advocates for one anothers' development. The teachers had an insider's perspective on each other's work contexts, goals, and practices, providing a certain kind of feedback that supported the goals of their individual and collective work. One teacher described how the conversational setting allowed participants to "track one person's ideas over time, the way they think about something . . over years" (fit.ld.7).

Responsiveness to relationships and an awareness of connections and responsibilities to each other formed an important component of friendship in this group. Many teachers highlighted this ethic of care (Gilligan, 1982). Savannah reported, "We care about each other as people" (pit.4). Martin said, "I cared by being there and listening, and continuing the intimacy of our friendships, because of the frantic lives we live separately" (pit.bm.5). Not only is caring often identified as a necessary relational component between a teacher and her students, it is also advocated for teacher colleagues (Noddings, 1992). "Teachers will also have to build in time to talk to each other about their own growth as well as that of students. They will have to offer each other moral support, intellectual/ academic help, and solid friendship" (p. 179).

Interrogation. Interrogation solicits *reflection and deep questioning among peers.*

> *[STEP+ is] different because it's reflective. Period. . . . I very rarely [reflect at school]. Even with the woman who I'm doing the Beloved unit with, very rarely do I feel like we are able to sit back and . . . say anything more than, "That went well," or "That didn't go well." We very rarely ask [the] question, "Why?" So that is what's different about the way that we talk in our group, where the purpose is to ask "Why?"* (pit.wp.7)

Patrick's comment reminds us that teachers *do* collaborate with their school site peers. However, his comment also cautions how, in collaboration at school, it is far easier to ask, "*How*?" rather than, "*Why*?" At STEP+ participants regularly questioned each other in order to bring to the surface and wrestle with normative and theoretical content. They asked each other, "Do your practices fit with your values?" This involved asking "pushing" questions that sometimes provided a catalyst for changes in thinking and or practice.

In their interrogation, they offered *multiple perspectives* to each other. Savannah noted, "It takes someone who's looking at [your work] from the outside, sometimes, to help you realize what you can't by *yourself*" (fit.ts.9). Again,

Savannah's comment underlines the isolation and non-interference that many novice teachers experience. In contrast, at STEP+, colleagues offered each other alternative understandings of their teaching practice and school. The teachers linked interrogation with "pushing":

> As a result, we're . . . really **pushing** each other to say, "No, well, no, *this* is what I believe," you know? "And it's obviously very different from what you believe, and why *is* that?" As in . . . "that's where I felt like there was a real gap." (fit.bm.6)

In the quotation above, Martin describes how interrogation was in the service of *focusing and changing beliefs and practice*. "This is what I believe…and it's obviously very different from what you believe, and why is that?" There were occasions when teachers publicly reformulated their conceptions of teaching and learning. This occurred in conversation at STEP+ and at regional conferences[3], as well as in their writing about their teaching. For instance, Patrick described how he reformulated his initial ideal of student-centered classrooms in which "teachers gradually move out of the loop." In a later conception, he identified how a teacher is never out of the loop, but is instead an "absentee tour guide" who is central to the discourse "because I'm giving them the tools to do all the things that they're doing," for example, "criticizing the conclusions that they came to" about difficult short stories (fit:wp.14).

These professional habits are described in the literature of critical reflection, which emphasizes the role of questioning and challenging others' underlying assumptions in order to transform practice. Critical reflection combines reflective practices (Schon, 1983) and critical education theory (Freire, 1983; Shor & Freire, 1987) and involves the teacher in thinking, criticizing in order to change practices and conditions (Kemmis, 1985, cited in Zeichner & Tabachnich, 1991).

CONVERSATIONAL STRUCTURES: CHECK-IN, CHARRETTE, ROLES

> *I guess I hadn't realized how institutionalized [conversation] was, within our group. But what's clear to me is that we not only have a way of speaking about topics, but we are so familiar with it. . . . There's a fluidity to this that's kind of remarkable. . . . There's a regularity that I see in terms of vocabulary, patterns of questioning, and then trying to answer some of the question, trying to finish a topic before we go on to a new one.* *(fit.wp.18)*

---

[3] The teachers presented their work at regional teacher research and education conferences in California in 1997, 1998 and 1999. They also presented their work at the annual AERA conference in 1999 and (soon) in 2000.

At STEP+, participants had conversational structures that facilitated talking. By the end of the first year, a participant could walk into any meeting, on time or late, and immediately recognize which conversational structure was occurring. The participant would also immediately know how, if, and when it was appropriate to participate. Three participants volunteered the term "vocabulary" to suggest how ritualized the discourse was within the conversational structures (fit.jm; fit.bm; fit.wp). The shared language and set of rules that governed the communication facilitated learning (Erickson & Schultz, 1981). For instance, the teachers knew what it meant to "present" or "respond" or "facilitate." The rituals and roles, and **capable facilitation** enabled the teachers to discuss themselves as actors navigating the difficult terrain of teaching, learning and school.

The Check-In

Fortifying friendship. In twenty to thirty minutes, check-ins offered friends time to reconnect, confirm bonds, and reassert sympathetic relationships, as well as to share successes. Many of the participants valued check-in for the sense of "community" and "intimacy" forged in the process. This in turn produced a "safe" climate in which to discuss content novice teachers might have kept to themselves in other professional settings. Participants used the word *intimacy* and *personal* to describe the sort of information they shared in the check-in ritual. David described this quality, "It was really nice and important to hear how other people are doing professionally and personally…When I personally checked-in, I valued the acceptance and the interest that all of us take in each others' life" (pit.ld.4). The personal content of check-ins included information about significant life events. There were announcements of imminent marriages (mn.196; mn.596; mn.197; mn.1097; mn.1197); a divorce (mn.496); hospital stays and the birth and deaths of loved ones (mn.1295; mn.196; mn.996; mn.297; mn.1098; mn.1298).

The following excerpt from a Year One meeting transcript demonstrates the mutual support that participants manifested during check in:[4]

> Melissa: Let's see. My kids are doing some really cool projects. We're scheduling our freshmen. They're presenting a portfolio of all the work they've done this semester. And so, I was so busy with that, that I didn't have any time to [prepare] anything for my sixth period today. So, I had them create their own test for Tuesday.
>
> Betty: Excellent!
>
> Melissa: . . . and they *liked* it, and it was *so good* (laughing)!

[4] This check-in occurs in the group's fifth meeting of Year One.

Sarah: Wow.

Savannah: Oh, that's great.

Melissa: But I didn't have time to [adequately plan]. So, I was really glad that I actually made it through the whole day without any major fuck-ups at all. (Quiet laughter from group.)

Savannah: Mmm. Yeah. (mt.196.1-2)

This check-in interaction is marked by candor ("I actually made it through the whole day without any major fuck-ups") and caring. The supportive exclamations and knowing laughter are empathetic recognition of the difficulties of day-to-day teaching. One member explained how the safety of STEP+ contrasted with the school site where colleagues and administrators could be talking and *evaluating*,

> When we sit down and talk about what's going on here, it's not the same as when you're at your school site . . . where there's someone sitting in a different position, . . . a position to judge you. . . . We don't look at our discussions that way at all. (pit.jm)

A ritual imbued with normative and contextual content. Although check-ins normally comprised succinct, workaday descriptions, the novice teachers often introduced troubling professional issues and doubts as well. In one check-in, Sarah publicly reevaluated her commitment to teaching in a way that could be construed as an admission of "failure," with feelings of doubt and frustration--something that other teachers also disclosed (mn.196; mn.297). Sarah mentioned in the November 1995 meeting that she was reluctant "go public with her problems" at her high school. At the same meeting, Savannah admitted that she felt as if she were "drowning." Other teachers described professional dilemmas related to counseling students (mn1095), addressing parents' skepticism about their efficacy and judgment (mn.995; mn1095), and making sense of peers' unprofessional and immoral conduct (mn.1196; mn.1296). Check-in was a ritual for divulging and exploring uncomfortable emotions associated with the practical dilemmas that these novice teachers encountered upon entering the profession.

An anticipatory ritual. The check-in had an important anticipatory relationship to the other conversational ritual, the charrette. Melissa speculated that check-in was a warm-up for a "deeper . . . discussion":

> I think the check-in helps to support [and] further the . . . community and I think from that point, we can go off on deeper, which would be the discussion. (pit.4-5).

Another teacher theorized that individual's check-ins were "barometers," providing members with a way to tacitly express the state of their being and the way they were prepared to interact during the rest of the meeting (pit.wp). This allowed participants to sense how far to go in a critique of a peer's practice or idea in the subsequent charrette discussion. For it was during these charrette discussions that the teachers were able to trade on their friendships to probe deeply.

The Charrette [vii]

> *In a charrette . . . normally, there is some kind of issue or some reason the video is arresting--whether it's something good happening, we don't know how it happened, or something bad happened, or something happened and we are not quite sure what happened. So* ***we are looking for other visions or interpretations*** *of what is on the video. . . . When you open yourself up . . . bring[ing] the video, you have to trust people if they are going to react and support you. And perhaps* ***be critical but in a gentle way.*** *And likewise you have to trust what they are telling you, so you have to be willing to hear what they are saying. Because otherwise there is no point in the exercise.* *(pit.jm.7; boldface added for emphasis)*

A ritual that favors interrogation and interpretation. Like check-in, charrette can be linked to the maintenance and building of friendship. Participants, however, linked the charrette process with interrogatory habits like "raising issues" and offering "multiple perspectives." In the previous quotation, Melissa emphasized that *presenters* are "looking for other visions and interpretations" from their conversational peers. Melissa's assessment of the charrette ritual underscores the connections between friendship, interrogation, and a culture for learning. Participants took turns sharing their work, knowing that their peers would "perhaps be critical . . . in a gentle way." But they came to the ritual with the expectation that they would come to "know how it happened . . . or what happened." Thus, the charrette ritual provided an occasion for interpreting and coming to new understandings of practice that, by themselves, the teachers might not have found, "because otherwise, there is no point in the exercise."

A ritual tailored to interpreting teaching, learning and school. Given its emphasis on questions and questioning, the charrette had a structure tailored to novice teachers' professional development. In charrettes, discussions moved from the discussion of experiences to the discussion of theories or "larger questions" even when the questions had no certain answers. Patrick described how the ritual supported the teachers' development of skills necessary to learn from their teaching experiences:

> Part of the function of the group seems to me to have been to take questions that are rather--they're like staples. They're a certain set of questions that we continually ask, and we apply them to new situations, or relatively new situations. So, we take old questions, and continue to apply them to new things that we try. (fit. wp.12)

In this response, Patrick describes that the group took "a certain set of questions that *we* [emphasis added] continually ask and apply to new situations, or relatively new situations." This habit of asking the same questions and reviewing the same issues in light of new experiences occurred primarily in the charrette ritual.

A structure that ritualizes discussions about **artifacts**. There was no "real" charrette without some classroom artifact at the center. The artifacts that participants chose to share within the structure ranged considerably. But videotape was frequently the artifact of choice. Participants had vivid memories of certain charrette conversations--in particular, those that were video-based. It may be that the participants gained deeper insight into practices from the video-based discussions than from discussions based on more intangible artifacts. Three participants recalled one particular video from Patrick's classroom. In his video, Patrick filmed a group of his students discussing a book in a literature circle. Melissa comments that it showed her that *all* students can discuss difficult content and can find evidence from the classroom texts and their personal experience, while making reasonable arguments. Melissa concludes her remarks on this video with, "It is the kind of thing I would like to see [in] my classroom."

> That charrette stands out for me because it was so cool to see those kids talking so deeply…There were probably 7 kids at the table and I was amazed that while one definitely didn't talk at all except for once that we saw, and a couple of them were not as involved in the conversation, they seemed to engage in this talking and the level of conversation that they were having was awesome. . . . A lot of people say that [those] kids, [being] in gangs or that have tattoos cannot do that. I think--yeah, they can. And it doesn't happen all the time but it would be great if they held those kind of conversations all the time. They just knew the book so well . . . They would refer back to the book and say, "Yes, but you know when Antonio does this and that and the other." And I thought, this is cool. They kept going back to the book. The other amazing thing was that they kept using their personal experiences. So it was really a multi-layered conversation and it was amazing. It is the kind of thing I would like to see [in] my classroom. (pit.jm.6)

The charrette offered teachers a wider purview of school. In the charrette (and check-in), participants had a vantage point from which to gain "perspective" on their own practice, their peers', practice and the profession more generally. They had access to a wide range of stories that their peers from *other* schools

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

recounted. The teachers benefited, not only from sharing stories and artifacts from their practices, but also from discussing, questioning, and reinterpreting them. These conversational rituals enabled the teachers to discuss school contexts (e.g., various disciplinary settings), collegial relationships, and perhaps most importantly, how and under what circumstances students learn. One teacher stated:

> [In addition to] seeing or becoming more familiar with different group member's classrooms and school settings, for me another satisfaction was seeing other subject areas in action and getting a better feeling for what goes on in those classrooms. (pit.pm.5)

The broadened purview that charrettes afforded may have counteracted the stage in a teacher's career that is notorious for a narrow focus on the classroom and on issues pertaining to control (Veenman, 1984). Like the check-ins, the charrette conversations, video-based or not, allowed participants to gain an appreciation for what they did not know, be it a peers' disciplinary or school site context. Moreover, the videos offered the teachers visions of possibility (Shulman, 1983). Savannah described during Year Two how seeing videos allowed her to see what she wanted to do but could not at the time (pit). Martin described how he gained a more robust view of school and of his profession:

> It's cool when, for example, David's doing a charrette on how people in math classes talk to each other. For me to see how [students] talk to each other in math classes in a sort of cutting-edge classroom, which I consider his to be, because that's knowledge I don't have, because I'm not in a math classroom. And I am interested in teaching the students, educating the students, and I have a much bigger picture because of the other charrettes. It's nice to see other classrooms. (pit.mb.5-6)

Summary. The charrette ritual benefited from the friendship (re)established in the check-in ritual. While bolstering those feelings, charrette was a ritual that especially favored interrogation and interpretation. The charrette was a ritual that supported learning since it provided a *social* structure for teachers to discuss the *artifactual* (representations of teaching). Richert (1987) found that these conditions, the social and artifactual, combined, facilitated novice teachers in reflecting about student learning with regard to curricular content and pedagogy.

Capable Facilitation

> *If this were only a group of five or six teachers, and I don't say it lightly, I think the discussions would be different. . . . To have access to the . . . discussions like this again, instead of like, "I don't want to teach this fucking text". (fit.jm.9)*

Nearly all of the teachers identified the university members' facilitation as playing a critical role in the group's learning. In the representative comment above, Melissa hypothesized about how the group would have functioned without the university facilitators: Betty Achinstein and myself. She also makes reference to the less than stimulating collegial conversations that were occurring at her school site.

The conversational rituals in STEP+ included regular *roles* for participants to enact, including "presenter" and "respondent". One of the central roles was facilitator. This facilitation occurred both in the conversational setting and away from it. As a way to make sense of how facilitation supported learning, I turn to a salient study from the field of social psychology. Lieberman, Yalom, and Miles (1973) conducted "the most extensive" controlled research inquiry into the effectiveness of groups designed to engender change (Yalom, 1995).[viii] Among the many findings of the study was a framework delineating four facilitation behaviors that correlated to positive outcomes for the group participants.

A facilitation framework

For the purposes of my study, I modified the framework before I used it as a lens. Rather than "emotional stimulation," I renamed the first quality, "**intellectual** and emotional stimulation." I did so because participants in this study regularly identified STEP+ as an "intellectual and academic pursuit" (pit.tk; pit.ld).

1. **[Intellectual and] *Emotional stimulation*** --challenging and confronting activity, intrusive modeling by personal risk taking and high self-disclosure;
2. ***Caring*** --offering support, affection, praise, protection, warmth, acceptance, genuineness, and concern;
3. ***Meaning attribution*** --explaining, clarifying, interpreting, and providing a cognitive framework for change, translating feelings and experiences into ideas;
4. ***Executive function*** --setting limits, rules, norms, goals, managing time, pacing, stopping, interceding, suggesting procedures(Yalom, 1995,p.498).[ix]

Intellectual and Emotional Stimulation. Associated with challenging and confronting, modeling and self-disclosure, *intellectual and emotional stimulation* was clearly a feature of STEP+ facilitation. The participants reported that the "pushing" discourse--which they linked to understanding--was initiated and was most often exhibited by the facilitators. This suggests that what became more of a lateral behavior--in time, *all* participants asked difficult questions of each other--was introduced and then routinely modeled by the facilitators. One participant described:

> It's oftentimes you and Betty that **push . . . the level of questioning beyond the logistics?** . . . I've noticed . . . that those of us who are in

> the classroom, a lot of times, [ask] questions that center around the logistics of the activity: what kind of article they're reading, what it looks like, step by step. Often, you guys bring about more theory--I don't even know if *theory* would be the right word, but *philosophy*--into your questions. (fit.pm.1, boldface for emphasis)

In this example Maddie suggests that teachers' questions tended to be about technical issues or "logistics," and that the university facilitators tended to move the discussion toward the theoretical. If "logistics" and day-to-day questions are the prevailing content for questions at school, then one important role that the facilitators played was providing an alternative, or at least a complementary, discourse.

After looking at a transcript of a meeting, Martin named the functional roles that Betty and I took: Betty acted as the "skeptical devil's advocate" and I acted as the "summarizer." Each of these roles functioned to stimulate intellectual conversation.

> Betty was playing the skeptical devil's advocate, asking tough questions. Like, in fact, she said, "I'll push you again on this one." And you could see that in her language that she's pushing. . . You, [in] your language, you summarized. (fit.bm.1)

Actions taken by facilitators that fall under the rubric of intellectual and emotional stimulation were not confined to the meetings. I regularly wrote and mailed monthly meeting notes to participants. In them I summarized the check-ins, charrettes, and upcoming business portions of the meeting. In the notes I used boldface to validate an individual's contribution to the dialogue and bracketed comments and questions to publicly provoke an individual to think further about a topic. The following excerpt , taken from a set of Year Two meeting notes, provide examples.

> **Sarah** has become more and more interested and puzzled by the role of dialogue within her U.S. history class. She is encouraged how her students naturally help each other (through talk) but is puzzled that when she designs opportunities for them to talk or tries to engage them in talk, they are more often than not, silent. 70-80% of the students in one of Sarah's classes speak Spanish as their first language. As a result she's trying to conduct an extended unit on Latin America area study. So far she feels as if the students have a "fairly low level of awareness of their own cultures." **[Sarah**, I am not doubting your assessment, but I am curious about what you do and don't know about their cultural knowledge. Say for instance that they have cultural knowledge that for whatever reason they weren't able or willing to demonstrate in the class . . . *able* because of communication skills or format for sharing; or *willing* because of format or comfort level, etc.] (mn.1096.1-2)

Facilitators' modeled dispositions that mattered for learning (e.g., friendship) and offered the content of related experience. At every meeting,

albeit briefly, facilitators "checked-in." During the second, fourth and fifth years, I took turns doing a charrette. These acts of self-disclosure reinforced norms of reciprocity and risk taking. To provide participants with a greater sense of perspective about the obstacles they were facing and in response to their check-ins, Betty and I sometimes responded with our personal stories. At one meeting, a participant described his shock about the unexpected arrest of a colleague at school. The teacher confided his worries that the principal would not convene the faculty to discuss personal feelings and to decide what sort of public face to put on the scandal. Because the check-in was so unusual and difficult, it warranted special deliberation and became an extended hour-long discussion (mn.1297). This was an occasion for facilitators to offer their "related experience" as a way to provide emotional and intellectual support. I described how my faculty dealt with a student's suicide and a student-body demonstration during the aftermath of the verdict in the Rodney King case.

Caring. The STEP+ site featured caring and emotionally attentive behavior. Yalom suggests the following indicators of caring: offering support, affection, praise, protection, warmth, acceptance, genuineness, and concern. Without belaboring the point, transcripts from the meetings include many examples of caring behavior functioning simultaneously with the other "effective" behaviors. For instance, Sarah shared a troubling memory "that she hadn't talked about with anyone": She had ignored a student's public comment that she was racist. By the time Sarah brought this up, the group was supposed to have finished meeting. Betty "petitioned" the group to take more time. Obviously this request represents an *executive function;* however, it also shows concern. In her petition for more time, Betty validated the importance of Sarah's story by using words like *difficult* and *amazing* to describe her genuine concern.

> Can I petition that we take 10 more minutes because we're in, just 10 minutes to close, this is a difficult conversation [inaudible] if people can do that, to petition just for 10 more minutes for this conversation? . . . I really kind of want to follow up on Sarah's like what people think they would do, I mean that's an amazing moment. (mt.996.41)

Betty's comment invited the group members to put themselves in Sarah's shoes, to describe what they would do without evaluating Sarah. These guidelines offered Sarah a measure of protection. Furthermore, it opened the experience up to others so that they, too, could learn from it in conversation. Soon after, Martin described how he reacted in a similar experience when one of his students publicly labeled him a racist. Although it was not an easy conversation, it was

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

one that many members commented on during retrospective interviews. Retrospectively, Sarah reflected on the conversation. She remembered it as a "sensitive topic," explaining that "[I] was working out what I thought as our group members comfortably (usually) pushed me to think about what I'd done" (em.1198). Certainly the caring and "responsive" behavior that the facilitators modeled and that the participants exercised in their friendship contributed to a climate in which participants felt "supported" and free to share "intimate" and troubling personal and professional information.

Meaning Attribution. Facilitators exhibited two behaviors that can be linked to meaning attribution: (1) active listening and summarizing, and (2) offering cognitive support. Participants identified facilitators as being "really good listeners" who would "repeat back" and "summarize" (fit.ld; fit.bm; fit:jm). The listening and summarizing served several learning functions. Repeating back validated an individual's ideas within the tapestry of a free-flowing conversation. Summaries helped to document and cement central ideas. And as one participant put it, the summaries punctuated ideas and allowed the group to pause in order to take on the next set of big ideas (fit.ld). In addition to these behaviors, facilitators regularly offered cognitive support to participants in conversation. They passed along "cognitive batons" that helped participants build meaning without rerouting the conversations (Meyer, 1999). For instance, in a Year Three discussion, Betty asked Patrick what was wrong with the ways that his students were (mis)using evidence. She wondered if the problem was that they did not exhibit a healthy and "continual skepticism."

Executive Functions. Beyond the more obvious functions of time keeping, interceding, suggesting, and modeling procedures, Betty and I spent a considerable amount of time behind the scenes as the teachers' confidants, advocates, mentors, and administrative assistants. There are many examples of the professional modeling that occurred--modeling about how to be a member of the wider educational community. For instance, I invited participants to grant-writing workshops and to regional conferences to make presentations. Over the years, I regularly shared curricular materials, educational articles, and access to professional contacts that helped to further the careers of the individuals and the work of the group. The recipe for subtle executive functioning is an inexact science that requires meeting a group at their point of need and interest.

GENERATIVE AND FORGIVING CONTENT

It is not enough to have norms and structures in place to facilitate learning. A group needs content that is worth discussing! It is noteworthy that the STEP+ group sustained interest in one topic, discussing formal RT and/or RT adaptations, in a majority of the conversations held over the years. In this final section I offer explanations for why this content sustained the group.

Generative Content yields technical and normative challenges. The pedagogical method that the group discussed was *technically* difficult. As the teachers in STEP+ knew, the creators of RT hypothesize that even under ideal circumstances it can take up to 20 practices before students achieve a level of RT mastery. Unlike some technical information presented during in-service trainings, RT is not a method that can be introduced on one day and then "used" the next day. It is a method that demands experimentation and analysis. Savannah wrote, "I have been struggling with . . . getting my students to understand the importance of critical thinking questions, when they have to look beyond the text for the answers" (tw.1296). Getting students to ask and then talk about *possible* answers, rather than *the* answer, was also difficult (co.696; co.196).

The teachers' discussion of videos and artifacts documenting their various RT adaptations proved to be both relevant and instructive to the group's technical needs and interests. Savannah wrote, "The video and the discussion are helping to clarify for me what RT can look like in the classroom" (tw.1296). The videos that the group discussed showed students and teachers enacting unfamiliar discourse roles.[x] RT proved to be technically difficult.

This topic prompted conversations about challenging *normative* content too. Predictable dilemmas emerged. The teachers' RT adaptations "transgressed" much of what school is "supposed" to be. Melissa's *students* questioned her when she asked high school seniors to read aloud in class (see baseline portrait in paper 4). RT and, more specifically, reading instruction, are supposed to occur in elementary school. Middle school and high school teachers are expected and prepared to assign the number of pages to be read and the questions to be answered, rather than to teach reading skills. Later in her career, Melissa noted her misgivings about using time to teach reading skills when state tests would assess her students' recall of specific information.

> RT [is] at odds with the expectations of practice. I could do it once, but can I take three days every month? No way. It's an exorbitant amount of time for [a practice that] is more process-oriented. . . . Our state is not process-oriented. Which isn't to say that the outcome isn't equally important, or the product isn't equally important, but I

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

don't think it's effective to do [RT] once. It needs to be ritualized. (fit.4)

Ongoing discussion of a topic with challenging, normative content like RT supports learning about the institutional regularities of school--in this case of classroom discourse. The STEP+ teachers were talking about a topic that involved enacting practices that went against the grain of regular classroom discourse, allowing them to encounter and discuss substantive, practical dilemmas about issues of curriculum and instruction. Many of the teachers were requiring their students to participate in "discussion" lessons (Rogers, Green, & Nussbaum, 1990) in which the students gave voice to authentic questions they had about curriculum. Yet those questioning habits trespassed regular classroom discourse. Essentially, the teachers were asking their students to frame and discuss questions that have traditionally been posed by teachers and textbooks. Empirical work on the regularities of classroom discourse reveals a "recitation script." Teachers ask all or nearly all of the questions about curriculum in any given classroom period (Mehan, 1979) and students answer; then, teachers evaluate (Cazden, 1988). Moreover, the questions teachers normally ask are not "authentic," since they ask about what they already know (Stubbs, 1976; Cazden, 1988; Goodlad, 1984; Sizer, 1984).

Forgiving content motivates experimentation. The teachers had a topic that sustained them because of its technical difficulty and its normative challenges. Not only was the topic generative, but it was also *forgiving*. That is, it urged experimentation while permitting reinvention. Originally, RT was designed to support "remedial" students with poor reading comprehension skills. In ideal RT situations, students work in small groups of four or five students *apart* from their other classmates, with the close guidance of a teacher or trained adult-facilitator-volunteer. Students learn to understand difficult reading material while mastering the reading processes necessary to do so (Trent, Artiles & Englert, 1998). Replicating this ideal was impossible; the STEP+ group members were not teachers of "remedial" students, nor did they have access to adult resources. Because of these discrepancies, "fidelity" to the ideal was never an issue (Cuban, 1998). RT almost begged the group to make technical adaptations.

SUMMARY AND QUESTIONS RAISED

Summary. STEP+ was a naturally forming collaborative, a "makeshift bungalow" (Huberman, 1992), dictated by the collective autonomy of the participants, all

novice teachers with common interests and shared backgrounds. As professional development it was sustaining and sustained.

STEP+ was a safe place to exercise dispositions of friendship and interrogation. The work of developing as professionals was facilitated by the ritualized structures for talking about teaching: check-in and charrette. The rituals had roles that also supported learning. There were presenters, respondents and facilitators, too. In these rituals, the teachers selectively disclosed their emergent practices to the scrutiny of their peers, sharing stories and classroom artifacts (student work, teacher writing, or videotape footage). In this private interference, they engaged in critical and supportive feedback. No one individual held a privileged authority; rather, peers shared in mutual risk taking and exchange of ideas. A particularly important feature of the STEP+ culture was that the teachers had generative and forgiving content to discuss.

STEP+ peers exercised normative dispositions toward teaching, learning, and collaboration that they could not or did not at their school sites. Moreover, the sustained intellectual focus of the discourse transcended the presentism prevalent in talk at their school sites. Although the teachers regularly had pressing matters to discuss, they were particularly sustained in talking deeply about issues and practices that they could not necessarily "use" tomorrow. Martin described this:

> We're talking about the foundations upon which we base our everyday practice. [Whereas] in this school setting, and in most of the settings in which I talk to teachers, it's not the foundations on which I base my practice, it's the practice itself. It's the little, nitty-gritty practice that teachers are sharing, not the assumptions behind them. The STEP+ group talks about an issue that this teacher holds dear, they are willing to put it out into the open for some feedback, and [have] a willingness to change the foundation a little bit. (pit.bm.6)

Martin's comment in particular and the study more generally suggest that novice teachers are hungry for discourse that does not treat theory and practice as being mutually exclusive. Britzman (1991) argues persuasively that "the dichotomy of theory and practice, . . . represents, in actuality, the fragmentation of knowledge from lived experience" (p. 54). In contrast, what made STEP+ powerful for the participants was that the "context of theory [was] practice" (Ibid.). The study suggests that participants could develop their philosophies of teaching because they discussed and developed theories that were born from experience. Thus, the case of STEP+, albeit an "n of 1," provides an empirical portrait that supports a growing body of literature theorizing a new paradigm for teachers' professional development, a paradigm

that describes teachers as active learners constructing knowledge among a community of peers. Teacher learning communities encourage reflective dialogue, the de-privatization of practice, and the collective focus on student learning (Kruse & Louis, 1995). Arguably, each of these qualities typified STEP+.

Implications for Induction Policies and Practices. At the same time as a new paradigm for professional development is being ushered in, the novice phase in teachers' development is receiving renewed attention. Policy support for induction has increased as research has convincingly portrayed the emotional and cognitive difficulties that novices endure as they take on the mantle of teacher. Induction assumes that if teachers are offered support during this critical time, the school community will benefit. Novices will teach better, feel a greater sense of efficacy and self-confidence, and as a result, rates of attrition will decrease. In this process, students will have access to better teaching, and school systems will be more efficient in delivering better education because they will not have to continually reinvest resources for new teachers (Huling-Austin, 1992). In this paper I have raised concerns about induction and mentoring that are conceived with goals of "retention" and "support."

Questions Raised

Policy makers could offer great help in refining this model of professional development experience. But one great hurdle is that policy makers would have to come to terms with the different structures and norms suggested by a STEP+ model. Unlike current induction models, STEP+ does not revolve around a more knowing presenter standing in front of a group of teachers sitting around a table, needing "help." This study describes something considerably different: Accountability in the hands of the participants. A gradually developing rigor in the observation and interrogation of practice resulted in participants asking, "What about this? What about that? Did you ever think . . ." A number of challenging policy questions arise. What levels of autonomy can policy makers grant teachers, novice or mentor, in their professional development? What amount of time and money can policy makers provide for novice teachers to walk the bridge into the profession? Furthermore, although I would argue that the site extended an intellectual bridge from pre-service into the first years of the teachers' careers, I would also argue that the experience did not exactly diminish the

loneliness and isolation that novice teachers experienced at their school sites. Therefore this study challenges policy makers and practitioners to determine ways to support the needs both of new teachers as well as their schools.[5]

This study also raises many questions about the viability of this group and others similarly situated. How do groups sustain themselves? How long should they exist? How do teachers navigate their entrances and exits from them? Such collaborations, situated outside the aegis of the school (or even outside the university), may be unstable over time. Even with its robust conversations about teaching, the STEP+ group was characterized more by attrition than growth, raising questions about the lifespan of a network with this agenda. I end with a final story about a teacher, Ruth, who quickly entered and exited STEP+. Her story illustrates many of the institutional problems that challenge teacher educators who would be advocates for other novice teacher learning communities and teachers like Ruth.

Ruth, a second-year teacher, joined the group for two months during Year Four before deciding to leave. On paper, Ruth seemed to be a good fit with the group. She graduated from the same teacher education program as all but one of the teachers; she valued and practiced reflective habits during and after pre-service. An exit interview with Ruth raised many questions about the viability of novice teacher networks (ipi.1298). She reported that she got the most out of the check-in ritual. She found it troubling, however, to enter a group that already had an agenda and a highly developed vocabulary. She questioned the ethics of turning her classroom into a laboratory to share with other teachers. The idea of contributing a video or student work to the charrette process seemed a little threatening.

Ruth described a department head who was skeptical about the worth of STEP+. He urged Ruth not to join, rationalizing that her time was better spent "worrying about tomorrow, tending to the planning of her curriculum, and thinking about her students" [I paraphrase Ruth's comments here]. Ruth noted that one factor that intensified her resolve to leave the group was that she could not claim credit for her participation in STEP+ in her professional development plan, in part because of her department head's negative assessment.

---

[5] At STEP+ one experiment during Year Three was for each member to invite one school-site colleague to join. The thought was that this could intensify the learning outcomes and bridge the network and school. Although this seemed like a promising strategy, only one *new* teacher became a long-time member.

Ruth's exit interview also raised questions about how novice teachers negotiate their professional development. One factor that seemed salient in explaining her departure from the group is that second-year and fourth-year teachers have different needs and capacities. Ruth said that she could not imagine combing through data and preparing to present at a regional conference when, in fact, she did not even feel adequately prepared to teach from week to week. This story also suggests just how unstable non-institutionalized networks really are. Ruth had no time or incentive structure to support her participation. It might have been easier for her to ratchet herself up the salary scale by enrolling in a correspondence course on California history than by participating in STEP+.[6] Incentives governing novice teachers' professional development are often not instrumental in the teachers' learning or development (Corcoran, 1995). Expedience often takes priority over intellectual stimulation and in fulfilling teachers' needs (Little, 1992a). Finally, although Ruth's department head wanted her to learn to teach, his lack of support for collegial learning effectively relegated her to the isolation of practice. He diminished her opportunities for finding her voice and place in a normative profession.

---

[6] This example reflects my personal experience of professional development in a San Francisco Bay Area school district.

REFERENCES

Achinstein, B. (1998). The ties that bind: Conflict within teacher professional communities. Unpublished dissertation. Stanford University.

Achinstein, B., & Meyer, T. (1997). The uneasy marriage between friendship and critique: Dilemmas of fostering critical friendship in a novice teacher Learning Community. Paper presented at annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Chicago, IL.

Alfassi, M. (1998). Reading for meaning: The efficacy of reciprocal teaching in fostering reading comprehension in high school students in remedial reading classes. American Educational Research Journal, 35(2), 309-332.

Ben-Peretz, M., & Kremer-Hayon, L. (1990). The content and context of professional dilemmas encountered by novice and senior teachers. Educational Review, 42(1), 31–40.

Britzman, D. (1991). Practice makes practice: A critical study of learning to teach. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Brown, A. (1998). Beyond the buzzwords: Reciprocal teaching, cooperative learning, and multiple intelligences today and tomorrow. Symposium address at annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Diego, CA.

Brown, A. L., & Campione J. C. (1996) Psychological theory and the design of innovative learning environments: On procedures, principles and systems. In L. Schauble and R. Glaser (Eds.), Contributions of instructional innovation to understanding learning. Hillsdale: Erlbaum Press.

Brown, A. L., & Campione J. C. (1990). Communities of learning and thinking, or a context by any other name. In D. Kuhn (Ed.), Developmental perspectives on teaching and learning thinking skills, 21, 108-126.

BTSA (1999). Developing as a professional. Online. Available at: www. cccoe.k12.ca.us/coe/curins/ sbtsa/publications.

Bullough, R. V., & Gitlin, A. D. (1991). Educative communities and the development of the reflective practitioner. In R. Tabachnick & K. Zeichner (Eds.), Issues and practices in inquiry oriented teacher education. London: Falmer Press.

Carini, P. (1979). The art of seeing and the visibility of the person. Grand Forks, ND: University of North Dakota Press.

Cazden, C. (1988). Classroom discourse: The language of teaching and learning. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

Clark, C. (1992). Teachers as designers in self-directed professional development. In A. Hargreaves & M. Fullan (Eds.), Understanding teacher development. New York: Teachers College Press.

Cochran-Smith, M. (1994). The power of teacher research in teacher education. In Sandra Hollingsworth & Hugh Sockett (Eds.), Teacher research and educational reform (p. 142). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Cochran-Smith, M., & Lytle, S. (1993). Inside/outside: Teacher research and knowledge. New York: Teachers College Press.

Corcoran, T. (1995). Transforming professional development for teachers: A guide for state policymakers. A Report prepared for the National Governors' Association. Washington, DC.: Center for Policy Research.

Cuban, L. (1988). Constancy and change in school, 1880 to present. In P. Jackson (Ed.), Contributing to educational change. Berkeley, CA: McCutchan.

Cuban, L. (1992). Managing dilemmas while building professional communities. Educational Researcher, 21(1), 4–11.

Darling-Hammond, L. (1994). The current status of teaching and teacher development in the United States. Background paper prepared for the National Commission on Teaching and America's Future.

Darling-Hammond, L., & McLaughlin, M. W. (1995). Policies that support professional development in an era of reform. Phi Delta Kappan, 76, 597-604.

Denbele, M., Feiman-Nemser, et al., (1995). Mentoring in the Service of Reform: The case of PDS Mentor Teachers. Paper presented at annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco, CA.

Denyer, J., & Florio-Ruane, S. (1995). Mixed messages and missed opportunities: Moments of transformation in writing conferences and teacher education. In Teaching & Teacher Education, 11(6), 539–551.

Dreeben, R. (1974), On what is learned in school. In Karabel & Halsey (Eds.), Power and ideology in education.

Duckworth, E. (1994). What teachers know: The best knowledge base. Harvard Educational Review, 54(1), 15-19.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Erickson, F., & Schultz, J. (1981). When is a context? Some issues and methods in the analysis of social competence. In J. Green & C. Wallat (Eds.), Ethnography and language in educational setings (pp. 147-160). Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

Feiman-Nemser, S. (1995). Are mentor teachers teacher educators? East Lansing, MI: National Center for Research on Teacher Learning.

Feiman-Nemser, S., & Floden, R. E. (1986). The cultures of teaching. In M. C. Wittrock (Ed.), Handbook of research on teaching (pp. 505–526). New York: Macmillan Publishing Company.

Feldman, A. (1994a). Teachers learning from teachers: Knowledge and understanding in collaborative action research. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New Orleans, LA.

Flood, J., & Lapp, D. (1990). Reading comprehension instruction for at-risk students: Research-based practices that can make a difference. Journal of Reading, April. 490-497.

Gee., J. (1989). What is literacy? Journal of Education, 171, 18-25.

Gee, J., & Green, J. (1998). Discourse analysis, learning, and social practice: A methodological study. Review of Research in Education, 23, 119-169.

Gilligan, C. (1982). In a different voice: Psychological theory and women's development. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Giroux, Henry. (1994). Teachers, public life, and curricular reform. Peabody Journal of Education, 69(3), 35–47.

Glaser, B., & Strauss, A. L. (1967). The discovery of grounded theory: Strategies for qualitative research. Chicago, IL: Aldine.

Goodlad, John (1984). A place called school. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company.

Goswami, D., & Stillman, P. (1987). Reclaiming the classroom: Teacher research as an agency for change. Upper Montclair, NJ: Boynton/Cook.

Hargreaves, A. (1992). Cultures of teaching : A focus for change. In A. Hargreaves & M. Fullan (Eds.), Understanding teacher development. New York: Teachers College Press.

Helms, J. (1996). Speaking of the subject: Science teachers reflect on the nature of science, science teaching, and themselves. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Stanford University.

Huberman, Michael (1992). Teacher development and instructional mastery. In A. Hargreaves & M. Fullan (Eds.), Understanding teacher development. New York: Teachers College Press.

Huling-Austin, L. (1986). What can and cannot reasonably be expected from teacher induction programs? Journal of Teacher Education, 37(1), 2–5.

Huling-Austin, L. (1992). Research on learning to teach: Implications for teacher induction and mentoring programs. Journal of Teacher Education, 43(3), 173–180.

Kruse, S., & Louis, K. S. (1995). Teacher teaming--Opportunities and dilemmas. Center on Organization and Restructuring of Schools. Brief to principals: No. 11.

Lawson, H. (1992). Beyond the new conception of teacher induction. Journal of Teacher Education, 43(3), 163-172.

Lieberman, A. (1995). Practices that support teacher development: Transforming conceptions of professional learning. Phi Delta Kappan, 76(8), 591–596.

Lieberman, A., & McLaughlin, M. W. (1996). Networks for educational change: Powerful and problematic. In M. W. McLaughlin & Oberman, I. (Eds.), Teacher learning: New policies, new practices. New York: Teachers College Press.

Lieberman, A., & Miller, L. (1984). Teachers, their world, and their work. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Lieberman, A., & Miller, L. (1990). Teacher development in professional practice schools. Teachers College Record, 92, 105–122.

Lieberman, A., & Miller, L. (1997). Transforming professional development: Understanding and organizing learning communities. Unpublished manuscript.

Lieberman, M., Yalom, I., & Miles, M. (1973). Encounter groups: First facts. New York: Basic Books.

Little, J. W. (1982). Norms of collegiality and experimentation: Workplace conditions of school success. American Educational Research Journal, 19(3), 325–340.

Little, J. W. (1990a). The mentor phenomenon and the social organization of teaching. Review of Research in Education, 16, 297-351.

Little, J. W. (1990b) The persistence of privacy: Autonomy and initiative in teachers' professional relations. Teachers College Record, 91(4), 509–536.

Little, J. W. (1992a). Teacher development and educational policy. In M. Fullan & A. Hargreaves (Eds.), Teacher development and educational change. London: Falmer Press.

Little, J. W. (1992b). Teachers' professional development in a climate of educational reform. Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis, 15, 129–151.

Little, J. W., & McLaughlin, M. W. (Eds.) (1993). Teachers' work: Individuals, colleagues, and contexts. New York: Teachers College Press.

Lortie, D. C. (1975). Schoolteacher, A sociological study. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Lyons, N. (1990). Dilemmas of knowing: Ethical and epistemological dimensions of teachers' work and development. Harvard Educational Review, 60(2), 159–180..

McDonald, J. P. (1992). Teaching: Making sense of an uncertain craft. New York: Teachers College Press.

McLaughlin, M., and Oberman, I. (Eds.) (1996). Teacher learning: New policies, new practices. New York: Teachers College Press.

McLaughlin, M. W., & Talbert, J. E. (forthcoming). Teacher learning communities in organization contexts. Stanford University: Center for Research on the Context of Secondary School Teaching.

Mehan, H. (1979). Learning lessons: Social organization in the classroom. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Meier, D. (1995). The power of their ideas: Lessons for America from a small school in Harlem. Boston: Beacon Press.

Merriam, S. B. (1988). Case study research in education: A qualitative approach. San Francisco: Jossey Bass Publishers.

Meyer, T. (1999). Conversational learning: The role of talk in a novice teacher learning community. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation. Stanford University.

Meyer, T., & Achinstein, B. (1998). Collaborative inquiry among novice teachers as professional development: Sustaining habits of heart and mind. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Diego, CA.

Miles, M. B., & Huberman, A. M. (1994). Qualitative data analysis: An expanded sourcebook. (2nd ed.) Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Miller, B., & Lord, B. (1995). Staff development in four districts. Newton, MA: Educational Development Center.

National Board for Professional Teaching Standards (1994). What teachers should know and be able to do. Detroit, MI.

Nelson, B., & Hammerman, J. (1996). Reconceptualizing teaching: Moving toward the creation of intellectual communities of students, teachers, and teacher educators. In M. W. McLaughlin & I. Oberman (Eds.), Teacher learning: New policies, new practices. New York: Teachers College Press.

Noddings, N. (1992). The challenge to care in schools. New York: Teachers College Press.

Palinscar, A. S., Magnussen, S., Marano, N., Ford, D., & Brown, N. (1997). Design principles informing and emerging from a community of practice. Paper presented at annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Chicago, IL.

Palinscar, A. S., & Brown, A. (1984). Reciprocal teaching of comprehension fostering and comprehension monitoring activities. Cognition and Instruction, 1, 117–175.

Patton, M. (1990). Qualitative evaluation and research methods (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Ragin, C. C. (1987). The comparative method: Moving beyond qualitative and quantitative strategies. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Richert, A. E. (1987). Reflex to reflection: Facilitating reflection in novice teachers. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Stanford University.

Rogers, T., Green, J., & Nussbaum, N. (1990). Asking questions about questions. In S. Hynds & D. Rubin (Eds.), Perspectives on talk and learning (pp. 73–90). Urbana, IL: National Council of Teachers of English.

Rosenholtz, S. (1989). Teachers' workplace: The social organization of schools. New York: Longman.

Schön, D. A. (1983). The reflective practitioner: How professionals think in actions. New York: Basic Books.

Sergiovanni, T. J. (1994). Building community in schools. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.
Shulman, L. S. (1983). Autonomy and obligation: The remote control of teaching. In L. S. Shulman & G. Sykes (Eds.), Handbook of teaching and policy (pp. 484–504). New York: Longman.
Shulman, L. S. (1988). Teaching alone, learning together: Needed agendas for the new reforms. In T. J. Sergiovanni and J. H. Moore (Eds.). Schooling for tomorrow: Directing reforms to issues that count. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
Soltis, J. (1994). The new teacher. In Sandra Hollingsworth and Hugh Sockett (Eds.), Teacher research and educational reform: Ninety-third yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
Stenhouse, L. (1985). Research as a basis for teaching. London: Heinemann.
Stigler, J., & Hiebert, J. (1995). Understanding and improving classroom mathematics instruction. Phi Delta Kappan, 7 (1), 14-29..
Stokes, L., Caskey, N., Heenan, B., Hirabayashi, J., Medina, K., Ramage, K., and St. John, M. (Eds.). (1998). Evaluating professional development: An exploration of the quality (and qualities) of the California Subject Matter Projects. Report 15. Inverness Research Associates.
Stubbs, M. (1976). Language, schools, and classrooms. London: Methuen.
Tabachnich, R., & Zeichner, K. (1991). Issues and practices in inquiry-oriented teacher education. London: Falmer Press.
Talbert, J., & McLaughlin, M. (1994). Teacher professionalism in local school contexts. American Journal of Education, 102 (Feb.), 123–153.
Thomas, G., Wineburg, S., Grossman, P., Myhre, O., & Woolworth, S. (1998). In the company of colleagues: An interim report on the development of a community of teacher learners. Teaching and Teacher Education, 14 (1), 21–32.
Trent, S., Artiles, A., & Englert, C. S. (1998). From deficit thinking to social constructivism: A review of theory, research, and practice in special education. In P. D. Pearson & I-N. Ashgar (Eds.), Review of Research in Education. 23, 277–307. Washington DC: AERA.
Veenman, S. (1984). Perceived problems of beginning teachers. Review of Educational Research, 54(2), 143-178.
Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). Mind in society: The development of higher psychological processes. M. Cole, V. John-Steiner, S. Scribner & E. Souberman (Eds.), Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
Weingarten, R. (1998) Testimony before the Board of Education of the City of New York on the school budget request for the 1998–1999 school year. February 11, 1998.
Yalom, I. (1995). The theory and practice of group psychotherapy (4th ed.). New York: Basic Books.
Yin, R. K. (1994). Case study research: Design and methods (2nd ed.). Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.

---

[i] This current framing of the problem does take into consideration how uneven the labor shortages are. For instance, the shortages vary considerably by subject matter and geography. A prospective English teacher in Connecticut with expertise in second language acquisition might do better to pack her bags and head to Montana (Bradley, 1999).

[ii] For instance, in the state of Washington, 50.8% of the math teachers hold neither a major nor a minor in the subject that they are teaching (see Archer, 1999, p. 9).

[iii] Teacher communities are defined by their collaborative endeavors and shared norms, values, and practices (Van Maanen & Barley, 1984, cited in Little and McLaughlin, 1993, p. 137). Teacher community is often identified as an antidote to the norms of privacy and isolation which teachers experience at the school site. See for instance, Lieberman, 1995; Lieberman & McLaughlin, 1996; McLaughlin & Talbert, 1993; Little, 1992a; Darling-Hammond, 1996; Sergiovanni, 1994; Stokes & Caskey, et al. (1998). For an introduction to "inquiry-oriented" pre-service, see for instance, Tabachnick & Zeichner, 1991; Bullough & Gitlin, 1991; Cochran-Smith, 1991.

[iv] Brown & Campione's curricular philosophy suggests a vision of classrooms as communities within which students take responsibility for the collective learning of deep, disciplinary ideas and concepts. Some of the specific instructional features include teachers maximizing opportunities for students to learn through talk. Additionally, the teacher utilizes recurring participant structures like "Reciprocal Teaching" (RT) to foster students' interdependent work, work that involves research, sharing, and performance. Ultimately, the hope is that the classroom that has a "dialogic" base, authentic inquiry and assessment, as well as ample opportunity for metacognition, provides students with the skills to learn the content and processes necessary for lifelong learning.

[v] The French word *charrette* means "chariot." One explanation of how the charrette protocol came to be goes like this. At one point in history, an architect would invariably need to spend the last hours of transit in a horse-drawn *charrette* to make final revisions before presenting

finished work to a benefactor. In the *charrette*, the architect would madly scribble away, making important changes to the plans. Another version of the *charrette* goes like this: prior to leaving town with plans in tow, the architect would pin plans to the exterior of the *charrette*. Anybody who cared to could scribble revisions to the plan. Once out of town, the architect would pull in the annotated plans and make revisions. Over time, the charrette process became ritualized in architectural firms and schools. Typically, an architect makes a presentation of a project to a critical cohort. Often the project is one that is soon due to be presented to a client. Therefore, the critical feedback from peers is a useful response that an architect keeps in mind during a final revision of a set of architectural plans.

[vi] For a nice description of how to do RT see Flood and Lapp (1990)

[vii] I have written conversational portraits of charrette discussions occuring during the first, second and third years after pre-service (Meyer, 1999).

[viii] The goal of their study was to understand the relationship between outcome, leader technique, and group process variables within encounter groups. Encounter groups, an outgrowth of the "T-groups" first led by social psychologist, Kurt Lewin, have been known for the experiential learning that they engender. The purpose of the group is to "implicitly or explicitly strive for some *change*--in behavior, in attitudes, in values . . . or in one's relationship to others, to the environment" (Yalom, 1995, p. 486). This framework seems worthy of application to this study. STEP+ was an action research group, since the process included regular time to observe and discuss "learning" as it occurred in the classroom and in school more generally, and since the purpose of these discussions was to make teaching better. There were other similarities as well. The *size* of the groups was similar; during the time of study the STEP+ group fluctuated between 8 and 13 people, and the original encounter groups were comprised of 10 people. There are some striking methodological parallels between the encounter group study and mine. In both studies, the participants were students attending Stanford University who self-selected into an accredited course. As in the encounter group study, the STEP+ participants were *not* self-identified as people in need of change, either as patients or as deficient teacher candidates, but rather were self-identified as "ostensibly healthy individuals seeking growth" (p. 494). Furthermore, participants exited both studies on their own terms. The testimony of the participants in both studies reflected a high level of satisfaction and experiential learning. When the researchers studied the individual encounter groups more closely, they found that the groups' high rates of satisfaction varied, and that outcomes were largely related to identifiable qualities of facilitation.

[ix] The researchers found that the second and third functions, caring and meaning attribution, had a linear relationship with positive outcomes. That is, the more the encounter group leaders used the behaviors associated with these functions, the greater the outcomes. The first and the fourth functions, emotional stimulation and executive functions, had a curvilinear relationship to outcome. That is, either too much or too little of these behaviors lowered the outcomes.

[x] In my classroom observations over the years, which often coincided with the teachers' experiments with RT, I noted repeatedly how strange or foreign RT looked and sounded in student-run groups. I noticed that students not only showed resistance to the practice but were not fluid in their collective work (cobm.596; cobm.1097; cotb.1096; cotk.1196).